

POLITICS AND MORALS

323

challenged the degrading doctrine that material force is supreme. The obligation of a state to survive may involve decisions which an individual might feel bound on ethical grounds to reject; for when war breaks out, however it originates, every belligerent throws scruples to the wind and fights desperately for victory. Here is a difference between public and private morality which cannot be ignored. The individual may sacrifice his life: the community must live on. A trustee cannot surrender to threats or violence an estate which is not his own. In other words, the action of a government within certain limits is determined by considerations of what we may call a biological rather than a moral order. And just as I approve resistance to flagrant aggression, I cannot denounce the successive revolts of the Christian communities of the Near East against the intolerable yoke of the Turkish invader, which had stunted their life for centuries as the growth of a tree is thwarted by an iron clamp. Nor can I censure the determination of nineteenth-century Italians and Germans to expel alien rulers in order to become nation-states like their neighbours. Most people would add that the North was right to take up the challenge of the South in 1861, to wage war for the preservation of the Union and incidentally for the abolition of slavery. Such elemental urges dating from a period prior to the Covenant and the ICellogg Pact seem to me, to quote Nietzsche's phrase again* beyond good and evil. There are, on the other hand, plenty of instances in modern history when Governments have taken action generally regarded as an offence against even the low standards of the time. I am thinking of such incidents as the alliance between Francis I and the Sultan of Turkey against

diaries V, the
devastation of the Palatinate by Louis XIV, the
seizure of
Silesia by Frederick the Great, the partitions of
Poland by
Russia, Prussia and Austria, the snatching of
Tripoli by Italy
in 1911. No modern-war aroused more universal
condemna-
tion than the struggle of South Africa at the turn
of the century.
Though acclaimed by a majority of Englishmen as
a legitimate
effort to hold British South Africa for the Crown,
to the rest
of the world it appeared as a brutal assault by a
mighty empire
on a little community of farmers who merely
asked to be left
alone. No less acute differences of judgment
were provoked
by the attitude of the belligerents in the war of
1914- Some
of the Powers could plead treaty obligations,
while others
plunged into the vortex at their own chosen
time without